



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING D	ATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,246	0/685,246 10/14/2003		Winslow M. Mimnagh	PHN 16187A	3989
24737	7590 0	07/07/2005		` EXA	MINER
PHILIPS IN P.O. BOX 30	NTELLECTUA	HINDI,	HINDI, NABIL Z		
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,			2655	

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Antique Commence	10/685,246	MIMNAGH ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	NABIL Z. HINDI	2655				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 J	<u>une 2005</u> .					
	s action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	•				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		` '				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received.  Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No. <u>08/759653</u> . ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)		·				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/14/05</u>.</li> </ol>	Paper No(s)/Mail Da					

In response to applicant's filing dated June 14, 2005. The following action is taken:

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-11 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,134,209. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the limitations claimed in the current invention as merely the same as the one claimed in the Patent such as: writing a series of test patterns on the medium with different write powers; reading the patterns from the medium; deriving a values from the read signal; forming a function (derivative); selecting an optimum write power wherein a multiplication constant "preset value" is stored on the medium.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to NABIL Z. HINDI at telephone number (571) 272-7618.

PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 2500